UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,266	07/26/2006	Tadahiro Ohmi	427-109	4778
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 07/13/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	NGUYEN, COLETTE B		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/587,266	OHMI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
COLETTE NGUYEN	1793	

	COLETTE NGUYEN	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of Areplies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of dension density dens	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropria	en. LED WITHIN TWO e extension fee ate extension fee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing date		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ⁻¹) 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	16 and 41.33(a)).		PTOL 324)
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) will will will will will not be entered.	-	-
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2 and 4-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Melvin Curtis Mayes/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: " 200 to 1 torr" raises new issue that would require further consideration

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments and amendments dated June 26tth, 2009 have been carefully reviewed but deemed not persuasive and the rejections stated in the final rejection dated April 1st, 2009 stands. The applicant's invention is "the exhaust gas is reacted with a reaction remover in the form of a viscous flow under a reduced pressure of 200 to 1 Torr. This key concept is clearly disclosed by Rostaing et al. (US5,993,612) in view of BreithBarth in DE4319118 as cited . Both teach to use a low pressure plasma at 0.01 -50 mbar, equivalent to 37 Torr so the already excited exhaust gas in the form of a viscous gas can react with a corresponding reactive element (reactive remover) for the purpose of removal of the impurities from the exhaust gas.

In respect to the argument that the Rostaing reference does not teach the gas to be partially excited. In the contrary, Rostaing cleary discloses in col2, In 10-18, and In 62-68 and in col3, In 1-10, that the gas is forced flown with a plunger to the exciter. The argument is not persuasive. All the limitations of the claims are anticipated by Rostaing in vew of Breithbath as stated.